



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

from his visits to Harvard, would say: "Greek is fast receding at Harvard", "Greek is fading away at Cambridge", "Greek is dying at Harvard".<sup>1</sup>

Recent official records at Harvard show "some thirty classical students in a total of 378 graduate students. The work appears in three categories: (1) primarily for undergraduates, (2) for graduates and undergraduates, (3) primarily (therefore not exclusively), for graduates . . . (of the thirty graduate students) sixteen are put down simply for Classics, two for classical and Indic philology, one for classical archaeology, five for classical philology, one for English and Latin, one, just one, for Greek philosophy".

At Yale, of 353 graduate students twenty-eight are recorded for classical courses as follows: Greek, four; Latin, nine; Classics, eight; classical philosophy, one; Latin and Greek, five; history and Latin, one.

At Baltimore in Professor Gildersleeve's seminar there were recently recorded some thirteen men (some fifteen years ago on a visit I counted twenty-five), the same thirteen appear in the Latin seminar also: most of them seem to take linguistic science under Professor Bloomfield as well. Some of the Fellows thirty-one years ago . . . read thirteen hours a day. All intensive reading is extensive, I am sure, in widening enormously range and sympathy . . . when all is close and direct, and translating banished, then all further incentives seem vain and superfluous, it is then that the noble verse of Southey marks a great inward metamorphosis, and a perpetual vocation:

My days among the dead are passed,  
Around me I behold,  
Where'er these casual eyes are cast,  
The mighty minds of old:  
My never failing friends are they  
With whom I converse day by day.

Mighty minds: at once we are led to discriminate between the cultural and the eruditional elements, between the original letters and the incrustation of many centuries. . . . There is a certain senility in some *seminar* youths, who can cite dittography and haplography, Arcadian and Cypriote dialects, talk of Phyles and Demes, of Ecclesia and Boule, and whose specialism reveals itself in ignorance of enormous masses of classical literature. Let not the academic young person be a pedant before his time, let him remember that he is still, at bottom, in the pre-critical period of life, where most apposite are the words of Macrobius' reminiscent mood: "Tum, cum admirabamur, nondum iudicabamus?" *Weh Euch dass Ihr Enkel seid!* but how can the doctorandus escape being smothered, during his triennium, by the strata of secondary and tertiary matter superimposed since Petrarch? T. E. W.

## REVIEWS

The Roman System of Provincial Administration to the Accession of Constantine the Great. By W. T. Arnold. New Edition, revised from the Author's Notes, by E. S. Shuckburgh. Oxford: Blackwell (1906). Pp. xviii + 288. \$2.00.

When Mr. Arnold's essay, which was originally written for the Arnold Prize in the University of Oxford, appeared nearly thirty years ago, it received a warm welcome as the only book in English which dealt with the administration of the Roman provinces. Its faults, however, were appreciated by the author, and it was his desire to revise and expand the work. From the realization of this hope he was prevented by his untimely death, and thus the task of revision has been undertaken by Dr. Shuckburgh. But the editor's alterations are few in number, and, with the exception of the welcome addition of an index, are confined to the bibliography and the notes, and the book remains what it was before—a good collection of facts, based almost entirely on Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, but inadequately treated and badly arranged. In an excessive fear of generalization, though admitting (p. 7) that "the administration was everywhere of much the same type", Mr. Arnold was too unwilling to draw conclusions, and too often presented merely facts instead of principles.

It was, however, in the arrangement of the book that the author was least successful. After dealing in two introductory chapters with the Limits of Period and Subject, and the Method of Acquisition and Organization of a Province, he divided the work into five parts—the Republic, the Early Empire, the Later Empire, Taxation, and Provincial Towns. The results of this arrangement are undue repetitions, unfortunate omissions, and the crowding of chapters with irrelevant material. Thus the *publicani* are discussed in the chapter on the Republic and again in that on Taxation, and both the legions and the census in the chapter on the Early Empire, while the provincial *auxilia* are omitted altogether. Again, the author inserted in the chapter on the Acquisition of a Province an excellent discussion of the Client-princes—a subject which deserves a chapter to itself, especially as the instances in which these kings were used to prepare their subjects for the rule of Rome (p. 16) are too few to make them important factors in the acquisition of provinces. Mr. Arnold's division, furthermore, rendered impossible any systematic treatment of provincial administration. By his chronological arrangement he was forced to deal with the position and powers of the governor in each of three chapters, thereby giving us three separate sections instead of one logically ordered ac-

<sup>1</sup> In a Phi Beta Kappa address delivered at Columbia University a year or two, Mr. Adams, who had then just retired from Harvard Board of Overseers, gave evidence that he had gained a juster appreciation of its educational and cultured value of Greek.

count of the changes in the office between Sulla and Diocletian. The advantage of the topical method of presentation over the chronological is well illustrated by the chapters on Taxation and Provincial Towns, for these constitute by far the best part of the book, each giving, as it does, a lucid and systematic presentation of the subject. Thus much would have been gained in the way of clearness and completeness had the author adopted this plan from the beginning, and dealt in separate chapters with the governor, the minor officials, the army, the cults, the provincial *concilia*, the client-princes, etc. But even did Mr. Arnold deem it best to arrange the book according to chronological principles, he should have chosen striking changes in the government of the provinces to mark the limits of his periods. In the Early Empire the all-important moment is not Caesar's order for a land-survey of the Roman world, or his abolition of the tax-farming system in Asia, but the bestowal by the Senate of the proconsular imperium on Augustus, and the division of the provinces into imperial and senatorial, and the beginning of the third period should be determined not by Caracalla's edict of 212, but by the institution of Diocletian's system of prefectures, dioceses and provinces, and the separation between the civil and the military powers which this made necessary.

The original plan of the book Dr. Shuckburgh was unwilling to change. But he has gone too far in his conservatism, for he has merely recorded the titles of the books that have appeared in the field of Roman administration during the last thirty years, leaving their conclusions quite unnoticed. Much has been written on the tax-farming corporations, but the sections dealing with this important topic have remained unaltered, and although the work of Guiraud and Kornemann has increased our knowledge of the provincial concilia and their officials, and the day has long since passed when the order of the Augustales was supposed to have been imitated from the college of the Sodales Augustales, on these subjects too the editor has added nothing.

The book as it now stands is faulty and inadequate, and it can be of little use either to the beginner, because it is unsystematic and incomplete, or to the advanced scholar, because it lacks originality, and especially because it has failed to include the results of recent investigation. Accordingly it seems unfair to the author to republish in these latter days the essay of his youth, and we cannot but regret that Dr. Shuckburgh felt himself unable to rewrite and enlarge the book, and so make it in every way worthy of the two distinguished names which it bears on its title page.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

DAVID MAGIE, JR.

Boyhood and Youth in the Days of Aristophanes.

By Arthur Alexis Bryant. Printed from the Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, volume 18 (1907), pp. 73 ff.

The treatment of a rather familiar theme is justified by the genial and sympathetic picture presented of the Athenian boy. More than this, the author has made an independent examination of the sources in contemporary literature, and the completeness of the evidence brought forward is in itself a contribution. At the outset Mr. Bryant, from his own special collections, 'nearly complete for the authors of the period' (450-375 B. C.), defines more closely the terms for the various stages of youth: *παῖς* ordinarily measures the period we call boyhood, up into the early 'teens' (this is apart, of course, from the generic use of the word as 'offspring' or its use as *=servus*); *μειράκιον* includes the later 'teens' and early 'twenties', and so is nearly convertible with *νεανίσκος*; *νεανίας* is regularly used of a slightly older man, *παῖδρον* or *παῖδριον* of a very young child; in verse *παῖδρον* is frequent for *παῖς*, but there is no clear case of *παῖδρον* *= servus*. Yet a constant overlapping of terms is found; thus in Plato's *Lysis*, *Lysis* is variously called *νέος*, *παῖς*, *νεανίσκος*. The complete collection of examples is not printed, but enough is given to substantiate the usages.

The 'coming of age' Mr. Bryant, adopting the reckoning of Aristotle, sets at the beginning of the Attic official year that follows the eighteenth birthday. The right of the youth of this age to attend the ecclesia, to vote, and to take part in debate there is maintained. Aristotle's statement of the *ἀτέλεια* of the *ἐφηβος* is denied for our earlier period, for the reason that even the orphans of citizens slain in battle were not thus exempted; and further, the amount of military service demanded did not justify it. Following Wilamowitz, Mr. Bryant makes an effective argument against the existence, in Aristophanes' time, of the ephebic college as Aristotle describes it. A veritable mass of incidents and passages is cited from contemporary literature, which, as concrete evidence, quite outweighs the more general considerations in favor of the institution, summarized by Girard in Daremberg et Saglio, 2, 2, pp. 622 ff. Just when the *ἐφηβεία* came into existence is the vexed question. The 'ephebic oath' with its ancient divinities and the support of one or two vase paintings is not evidence for the early presence of the formal ephebic organization; nor is the public arming of the ephebes—if this is really early. Mr. C. R. Morey (American Journal of Archaeology, second series, volume xi [1907]) interprets the painting on a black-figured Attic vase as "a representation of the public arm-